



Memorandum

TO: Honorable Mayor &
City Council

FROM: Toni Taber, CMC
Acting City Clerk

SUBJECT: The Public Record
May 31, 2013 – June 6, 2013

DATE: June 7, 2013

ITEMS FILED FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

- (a) Letter to Mayor Reed and the City Council from David Wall dated June 6, 2013, regarding Affordable Housing is a "TAX" masquerading as a "FEE." Nexus Study is a "skirt the law study."
- (b) Letter to Mayor Reed and the City Council from David Wall dated June 6, 2013, regarding Support "CINDY CHAVEZ" FOR SANTA CLARA COUNTY SUPERVISOR, DISTRICT 2!"
- (c) Letter to Mayor Reed and the City Council from David Wall dated June 6, 2013, regarding Is Measure B the reason for "reviving the employee referral program" or are CM Rocha's Memos?
- (d) Letter to Mayor Reed and the City Council from David Wall dated June 6, 2013, regarding How can a neighbor's house, having (12) people in the house; similar to mine, (1050 sq. ft.), pay the same Sewer Service and Use Charges that my wife and I pay?
- (e) Letter to Mayor Reed and the City Council from David Wall dated June 6, 2013, regarding I do not consent to pay for "South Bay Water Recycling" and or for the "Silicon Valley Advanced Water Purification Plant" via my Sewer Service and Use Charges.
- (f) Memorandum to the City Council from Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County (LAFCO) dated June 6, 2013, regarding LAFCO Budget for Fiscal Year 2013-2014.

Toni Taber, CMC
Acting City Clerk

TT/kc

Honorable Mayor and City Council Members

June 7, 2013

Subject: The Public Record: May 31, 2013 – June 6, 2013

Page 2 of 2

| | | |
|---------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Distribution: | Mayor/Council | Director of Transportation |
| | City Manager | Public Information Office |
| | Assistant City Manager | San José Mercury News |
| | Assistant to City Manager | Library |
| | Council Liaison | Director of Public Works |
| | Director of Planning | City Auditor |
| | City Attorney | Director of Finance |

RECEIVED
San Jose City Clerk

2013 JUN -6 PM 4:31

June 6, 2013

Mayor Reed and Members San José City Council
200 East Santa Clara Street
San José, California 95113-1905

Re: Affordable Housing is a "TAX" masquerading as a "FEE." Nexus Study is a "skirt the law study."

San José continues to chart a course for the new entitlement program-"Affordable Housing."

Developers will pass the "TAX a.k.a. FEE" to the buyers or renters.

Politicians, Developers and "Free-loaders" will benefit. Property taxpayers will foot bill for services.

Dateline: City Desk [Thursday, (06.06.13)]. "TAX (a.k.a. FEE)" will be paid by the poor.

Here is a quote from the San José Mercury News; *"San Jose's action Tuesday approves a "nexus study" on the proposed fee, aimed at demonstrating a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which it is assessed."* [San José Mercury News; (06.05.13); Page A (9)].

"...reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of project on which it is assessed." This "fee" is a "tax" to create an entitlement program to fund housing for those who, without a taxpayer subsidies, could not live San José. **Affordable Housing projects do not pay property taxes that pay for city services.**

"Affordable Housing Projects" do not pay property taxes. How can this pass "Constitutional muster?" This issue was asked during the ["Rules and Open Government committee" meeting; [(06.05.13)], but, there was not any "official comment" on the issue.

Should a private person initiate a petition to Federal District Court requesting a trial to discuss the merits of conferring "tax exempt status" of "Affordable Housing projects" versus "Single Family Homes" and "other" housing products? (The "Constitution" is to be used as a "Federal Question.")

Also discussed during the aforementioned, ["Rules and Open Government committee" meeting; (06.05.13)], was a discussion on the Mayor's upcoming budget and the "absence of any figures pertaining to revenues lost from Affordable Housing Projects (again, **"Affordable Housing Projects" do not pay property taxes.**)"

San José "elected officials" should "explain why Affordable Housing projects are exempt from paying "PROPERTY TAXES" and why every other housing product must do so." Especially, the Councilmembers who are candidates for Mayor in 2014.

Respectfully submitted,

David S. Wall
06.06.13

Cc: City Attorney
City Auditor / City Manager

RECEIVED
San Jose City Clerk

2013 JUN -6 PM 4:31

June 6, 2013

Mayor Reed and Members San José City Council
200 East Santa Clara Street
San José, California 95113-1905

Re: Support- "CINDY CHAVEZ" FOR SANTA CLARA COUNTY SUPERVISOR, DISTRICT 2!"

BE AWARE OF "REFORMIST LINGO JINGO" FROM THE "REFORM CANDIDATE!"

CITY EMPLOYEES HAVE SUFFERED FROM "REFORMS-THAT BREAK CONTRACTS!"

"CINDY CHAVEZ WILL SUPPORT GOOD PAYING UNION JOBS AND BENEFITS!"

In my opinion, "Cynthia Marie Chavez (Cindy Chavez)" is the choice for Supervisor and...

...Mayor Reed, Vice-Mayor Nguyen, CMs: Herrera, Constant, Liccardo are of...

..."NO POLITICAL AND OR OTHER MEASURES OF VALUE TO CITY EMPLOYEES!"

THE SAN JOSÉ MERCURY NEWS IS "NO FRIEND" TO CITY EMPLOYEES!

Dateline: City Desk [Thursday, (06.06.13)]. *The times they need a, ch-ch-ch-changin'.*

***Again, in my opinion, the only candidate for Santa Clara County Supervisor, District 2 is "Cindy Chavez." *The "reform candidate" should not be trusted or respected for any reason! All City Employees and Retirees have suffered by the lies and untruths that served as the foundations of Measure B. The only candidate that will protect our "brother and sister union members in the County-as well City of San José employees and retirees is Cindy Chavez. The "Reform candidate" is sure to "break employment contracts of honorable civil servants." Investigate for yourselves the type of people who support the "Reform candidate." *The "Reform candidate" is a "special interest political hack, NOT to be trusted.**

It is the hope and prayer of this citizen that you; **Mayor Reed, Vice-Mayor Nguyen, CMs: Herrera, Constant, Liccardo** will change your misguided political affiliations and support the candidate that will protect "good wages and benefits for; city, county employees and retirees."

The candidate is, "Cindy Chavez for Supervisor, District 2!"

Respectfully submitted,

David S. Wall
06.06.13

Cc: San José Police Officer's Association / San José Fire Fighters, Local 230
Association of Legal Professionals
ALL OTHER CITY OF SAN JOSÉ EMPLOYEES

RECEIVED
San Jose City Clerk

2013 JUN -6 PM 4:31

June 6, 2013

Mayor Reed and Members San José City Council
200 East Santa Clara Street
San José, California 95113-1905

Re: Is Measure B the reason for "reviving the employee referral program" or are CM Rocha's Memos?

I'll put my "betting money" the "employee referral program" is yet, "another cost of Measure B."

It is a "tough sell" to convince or hoodwink anyone to work for the City of San José!

There are consequences for "breaching employee contracts" and the "full costs" are not yet tallied.

Dateline: City Desk [Thursday, (06.06.13)]. NEVER "Breach employee contracts!"

Attending the "Rules and Open Government Committee" is always better than staying at home and watching cable or satellite television. At "Rules," there is "never a dull moment," just periodic dull decisions made by some of the dullards of the doyen class.

For the last couple of weeks, CM Rocha (a.k.a., Fr. Rocha) has been passionately declaring through written memorandum that the City Manager is not doing enough "outside recruiting" for executive positions. CM Rocha's goal of achieving the best executive employee is honorable. However, I am befuddled that CM Rocha doesn't seem to appreciate the destructive magnitude that Measure B is continuing to wreak havoc with the city organization (and not to forget, ongoing expensive costs to the taxpayers).

For example, city employees who can "retire" are doing so. Other employees who have sought jobs in the private sector or other government agencies are doing so. Both of the aforementioned classes of city employees are leaving city service in "vast numbers" as a direct and proximate cause of Measure B. The City Manager cannot "find, entice and hire enough qualified perspective employees outside the city" because...who wants to work for a city that "unilaterally, breaches employee contracts?" To be fair, there are some people who will accept employment with the City of San José. They will stay as long as they need to receive training and experience. When their pay and benefits are "unilaterally cut," they too will leave.

The City of San José has been reduced to a "regional training organization" that provides trained employees for outside businesses and governmental agencies. The quality of City services will continue to decline further. The voting majority of Council is wholly untrustworthy and in general terms, from an organizational management perspective, grossly incompetent beyond a reasonable doubt.

And now...on the June 18th City Council Agenda, (Item 3.12); "Hiring Incentive Referral Pilot Program for City Employees," if Council approves, will go into effect July 1, 2013.

Is the "Hiring Incentive Referral Pilot Program for City Employees", a direct and proximate cause of CM Rocha's memorandums to "RULES" or yet, another damning consequence of Measure B?

Respectfully submitted,

Cc: City Attorney / City Auditor / City Manager

David S. Wall
06.06.13

RECEIVED
San Jose City Clerk

2013 JUN -6 PM 4:31

June 6, 2013

Mayor Reed and Members San José City Council
200 East Santa Clara Street
San José, California 95113-1905

Re: How can a neighbor's house, having twelve (12) people in the house; similar to mine, (1050 sq. ft.), pay the same Sewer Service and Use Charges and Storm Sewer Service Charges that my wife and I pay?

Sewer Service and Use Charges and Storm Sewer Service Charges do not reflect Proposition 218.

Dateline: City Desk [Thursday, (06.06.13)]. *Proposition 218 governs rates on issues contained herein.*

On the June 18th City Council Agenda, (Item 3.9); **"2013-2014 County Assessment Roll for Sewer Service and Use Charges and Storm Sewer Service, Adopt a resolution: Setting a Public Hearing on Tuesday, August 13, 2013, at 1:30 p.m. for the 2013-2014 Sewer Service and Use Charges and Storm Sewer Service Charges based on annual reports of the Director of Finance and direct the City Clerk to publish notice of time and place of the hearing; Allowing the Director of Finance to file, with the City Clerk, Sewer Service and Use Charges and Storm Sewer Service Charges on or before July 15, 2013."**

Was the sewage flow from my house, into the collection system for proper treatment at the San José / Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP) analytically measured for calculations of **Sewer Service and Use Charge, under the governance of Proposition 218?**

How are the Storm Sewer Service Charges calculated with reference to Proposition 218?

Again, **"How can a neighbor's house, having twelve (12) people in the house; (6) ADULTS AND (6) CHILDREN; similar to mine, (1050 sq. ft.), pay the same Sewer Service and Use Charges and Storm Sewer Service Charges that my wife and I pay?"**

I want both my Sewer Service and Use Charges and Storm Sewer Service Charges to be calculated under the governance of Proposition 218, as well as everyone else so charged.

*****Where is the San José Mercury News on the issue of Proposition 218 and how the Sewer Service and Use Charges and Storm Sewer Service Charges are assessed?**

Respectfully submitted,

David S. Wall
06.06.13

///
///
///

RECEIVED
San Jose City Clerk

2013 JUN -6 PM 4:30

June 6, 2013

Mayor Reed and Members San José City Council
200 East Santa Clara Street
San José, California 95113-1905

Re: I do not consent to pay for "South Bay Water Recycling" and or for the "Silicon Valley Advanced Water Purification Plant" via my Sewer Service and Use Charges.

Sewer Service and Use Charges are governed by Proposition 218.

Dateline: City Desk [Thursday, (06.06.13)]. *Stop "abusing the Sewer Service & Use Charges!"*

Why haven't YOU come up with an alternative financing plan for South Bay Water Recycling and the Silicon Valley Advanced Water Purification Plant?

YOU have had ample TIME and WARNING to do so.

AGAIN, "I do not consent to pay for "South Bay Water Recycling" and or for the "Silicon Valley Advanced Water Purification Plant" via my Sewer Service and Use Charges."

Have YOU even read Proposition 218?

The Cupertino Sanitary District, the City of Milpitas must have because they; NOTICED THE CITY OF SAN JOSÉ OF INTENT TO SUE IF THEY ARE CHARGED FOR ANY ADDITIONAL EXPANSIONARY COSTS OF SBWR.

Respectfully submitted,

David S. Wall
06.06.13

///
///
///

Cc: City Attorney / City Auditor
City Manager / Director of Finance
Director ESD / Director PW



June 6, 2013

TO: County Executive, Santa Clara County
City Managers, Cities in Santa Clara County
District Managers, Independent Special Districts in Santa Clara County

FROM: Neelima Palacherla, LAFCO Executive Officer

SUBJECT: **LAFCO BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013-2014**

At its June 5, 2013 meeting, LAFCO adopted its Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2013-2014. The adopted Final Budget is attached for your information. Based on the apportionment method specified in Government Code §56381 and §56381.6, the County Auditor-Controller will apportion LAFCO's net operating expenses to the cities, the County and the independent special districts. Please expect to receive an invoice from the County Controller's Office in the next few days.

If you have any questions regarding the LAFCO budget or cost apportionment, do not hesitate to contact me at (408) 299-5127 or at neelima.palacherla@ceo.sccgov.org.

Thank you.

cc: Board of Supervisors, Santa Clara County
City Council Members, Cities in Santa Clara County
Independent Special District Board Members
Cities Association of Santa Clara County
Santa Clara County Special Districts Association

70 West Hedding Street • 11th Floor, East Wing • San Jose, CA 95110 • (408) 299-5127 • www.santaclara.lafco.ca.gov

COMMISSIONERS: Pete Constant, Sequoia Hall, Margaret Abe-Koga, Linda J. LeZotte, Mike Wasserman, Susan Vicklund Wilson

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONERS: Johnny Khamis, Yoriko Kishimoto, Terry Trumbull, Cat Tucker

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Neelima Palacherla

LAFCO MEETING: June 5, 2013
TO: LAFCO
FROM: Neelima Palacherla, Executive Officer
SUBJECT: FINAL LAFCO BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. Adopt the Final LAFCO Budget for Fiscal Year 2013-2014. (Attachment A)
2. Find that the Final LAFCO Budget for Fiscal Year 2014 is expected to be adequate to allow the Commission to fulfill its statutory responsibilities.
3. Authorize staff to transmit the Final LAFCO Budget adopted by the Commission including the estimated agency costs to each of the cities, to the special districts, to the County, to the Cities Association and to the Special Districts Association.
4. Direct the County Auditor-Controller to apportion LAFCO costs to the cities; to the special districts; and to the County; and to collect payment pursuant to Government Code §56381.

REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT / PRELIMINARY BUDGET

The Commission on April 3, 2013, adopted LAFCO's preliminary budget for Fiscal Year 2013-2014. The preliminary budget was prepared using the best information available at that time. Since then, more current information on projected employee salary / benefits costs has been made available by the County. The proposed final budget has been refined to reflect the latest available information. An amount of \$10,893 has been added to the projected employee salaries/benefits item, increasing the total allocated amount to \$432,087.

As a result of the above change, the net FY 2014 operating expenses in the proposed Final Budget are increased from \$598,004 to \$608,897, resulting in slightly higher costs to the agencies.

Despite the proposed increase in expenditures, overall expenditures budgeted for FY 2014 remain lower than expenditures in the adopted FY 2013 budget by approximately 2.75%.

COST APPORTIONMENT TO CITIES, DISTRICTS AND COUNTY

The CKH Act requires LAFCO costs to be split in proportion to the percentage of an agency's representation (excluding the public member) on the Commission. The LAFCO of Santa Clara County is composed of a public member, two County board members, two city council members, and since January 2013 — by two special district members. Government Code §56381(b)(1)(A) provides that when independent special districts are seated on LAFCO, the county, cities and districts must each provide a one-third share of LAFCO's operational budget.

Since the City of San Jose has permanent membership on LAFCO, as required by Government Code §56381.6(b), the City of San Jose's share of LAFCO costs must be in the same proportion as its member bears to the total membership on the commission, excluding the public member. Therefore in Santa Clara County, the City of San Jose pays one sixth and the remaining cities pay one sixth of LAFCO's operational costs. The remaining cities' share must be apportioned in proportion to each city's total revenue, as reported in the most recent edition of the Cities Annual Report published by the Controller, as a percentage of the combined city revenues within a county.

Government Code Section 56381 provides that the independent special districts' share shall be apportioned in proportion to each district's total revenues as a percentage of the combined total district revenues within a county. The Santa Clara County Special Districts Association (SDA), at its August 13, 2012 meeting, adopted an alternative formula for distributing the independent special districts' share to individual districts. The SDA's agreement requires each district's cost to be based on a fixed percentage of the total independent special districts' share.

LAFCO's net operating expenses for Fiscal Year 2014 is \$608,897.

Cost to Agencies

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| County of Santa Clara | \$202,966 |
| City of San Jose | \$101,483 |
| Remaining 14 Cities in the County | \$101,483 |
| 17 Independent Special Districts | \$202,966 |

A draft of the estimated apportionment of the FY 2014 costs to the individual cities and districts is included as **Attachment B**. Because special districts were seated on LAFCO in January 2013, the 17 independent special districts will be charged a pro-rated amount of the annual cost for the current Fiscal Year 2013. The County and the cities will receive a corresponding credit. The pro-rated costs /credits are depicted in **Attachment C**. The FY 2013 pro-rated costs for each agency will be added or credited to the agency's FY 2014 share of LAFCO cost.

BACKGROUND

The Cortese Knox Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (CKH Act) which became effective on January 1, 2001, requires LAFCO to annually adopt a draft budget by May 1 and a final budget by June 15 at noticed public hearings. Both the draft and the final budgets are required to be transmitted to the cities, to the special districts and to the County. Government Code §56381(a) establishes that at a minimum, the budget must be equal to that of the previous year unless the Commission finds that reduced staffing or program costs will nevertheless allow it to fulfill its statutory responsibilities. Any unspent funds at the end of the year may be rolled over into the next fiscal year budget. Government Code §56381(c) requires the County Auditor to request payment from the cities, special districts and the County no later than July 1 of each year for the amount each agency owes based on the net operating expenses of the Commission and the actual administrative costs incurred by the Auditor in apportioning costs and requesting payment.

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment A: Proposed Final LAFCO Budget for Fiscal Year 2014
- Attachment B: Costs to Agencies Based on the Proposed Final Budget
- Attachment C: Pro-rated Costs / Credits to Agencies for FY 2013

**FINAL LAFCO BUDGET
FISCAL YEAR 2013 - 2014**

ITEM # 6
Attachment A

| ITEM # | TITLE | APPROVED FY 2013 BUDGET | ACTUALS Year to Date 2/13/2013 | YEAR END PROJECTIONS 2013 | FINAL FY 2014 BUDGET |
|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| EXPENDITURES | | | | | |
| Object 1: | Salary and Benefits | \$392,182 | \$244,050 | \$408,672 | \$432,087 |
| Object 2: | Services and Supplies | | | | |
| 5258200 | Intra-County Professional | \$55,000 | \$2,882 | \$10,000 | \$45,000 |
| 5255800 | Legal Counsel | \$55,000 | \$31,707 | \$55,000 | \$57,000 |
| 5255500 | Consultant Services | \$120,000 | \$24,434 | \$100,000 | \$100,000 |
| 5285700 | Meal Claims | \$750 | \$88 | \$400 | \$750 |
| 5220200 | Insurance | \$5,600 | \$4,182 | \$5,600 | \$5,600 |
| 5250100 | Office Expenses | \$2,000 | \$67 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 |
| 5255650 | Data Processing Services | \$2,700 | \$1,247 | \$2,700 | \$2,700 |
| 5225500 | Commissioners' Fee | \$7,000 | \$1,400 | \$6,000 | \$10,000 |
| 5260100 | Publications and Legal Notices | \$2,500 | \$112 | \$1,000 | \$2,500 |
| 5245100 | Membership Dues | \$7,154 | \$7,154 | \$7,154 | \$7,319 |
| 5250750 | Printing and Reproduction | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$500 | \$1,500 |
| 5285800 | Business Travel | \$11,000 | \$3,235 | \$8,000 | \$15,000 |
| 5285300 | Private Automobile Mileage | \$2,000 | \$30 | \$1,000 | \$2,000 |
| 5285200 | Transportation&Travel (County Car Usage) | \$1,088 | \$231 | \$1,000 | \$1,088 |
| 5281600 | Overhead | \$43,133 | \$21,567 | \$43,133 | \$43,473 |
| 5275200 | Computer Hardware | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$2,000 | \$11,000 |
| 5250800 | Computer Software | \$2,000 | \$3,114 | \$3,500 | \$2,500 |
| 5250250 | Postage | \$2,000 | \$316 | \$1,000 | \$2,000 |
| 5252100 | Staff/Commissioner Training Programs | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$2,000 |
| 5701000 | Reserves | \$50,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL EXPENDITURES | | \$766,607 | \$345,816 | \$659,659 | \$745,517 |
| REVENUES | | | | | |
| 4103400 | Application Fees | \$25,000 | \$37,437 | \$40,000 | \$25,000 |
| 4301100 | Interest: Deposits and Investments | \$5,000 | \$2,163 | \$4,500 | \$5,000 |
| | Savings/Fund Balance from previous FY | \$173,047 | \$208,219 | \$208,219 | \$106,620 |
| TOTAL REVENUE | | \$203,047 | \$247,819 | \$252,719 | \$136,620 |
| NET LAFCO OPERATING EXPENSES | | \$563,560 | \$97,997 | \$406,940 | \$608,897 |
| 3400800 | RESERVES | \$100,000 | \$150,000 | \$150,000 | \$150,000 |
| COSTS TO AGENCIES | | | | | |
| 4600100 | Cities (San Jose 50% + Other Cities 50%) | \$281,780 | \$281,780 | \$281,780 | \$202,966 |
| 5440200 | County | \$281,780 | \$281,780 | \$281,780 | \$202,966 |
| | Special Districts | | | | \$202,966 |

LAFCO COST APPORTIONMENT: County, Cities, Special Districts
Costs to Agencies Based on the Final 2014 LAFCO Budget

ITEM # 6
Attachment B

| LAFCO Net Operating Expenses for 2014 | | | | \$608,897 |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| Jurisdictions | Revenue per 2010/2011 Report | Percentage of Total Revenue | Allocation Percentages | Allocated Costs |
| County | N/A | N/A | 33.33333333% | \$202,965.67 |
| Cities Total Share | | | 33.33333333% | \$202,965.67 |
| San Jose | N/A | N/A | 50.00000000% | \$101,482.83 |
| Other cities share | | | 50.00000000% | \$101,482.83 |
| Campbell | \$40,087,404 | 2.1493629% | | \$2,181.23 |
| Cupertino | \$54,124,686 | 2.9019987% | | \$2,945.03 |
| Gilroy | \$130,123,837 | 6.9768386% | | \$7,080.29 |
| Los Altos | \$36,959,656 | 1.9816627% | | \$2,011.05 |
| Los Altos Hills | \$9,460,965 | 0.5072677% | | \$514.79 |
| Los Gatos | \$35,312,778 | 1.8933622% | | \$1,921.44 |
| Milpitas | \$94,169,561 | 5.0490813% | | \$5,123.95 |
| Monte Sereno | \$2,527,948 | 0.1355408% | | \$137.55 |
| Morgan Hill | \$47,971,760 | 2.5720977% | | \$2,610.24 |
| Mountain View | \$162,285,614 | 8.7012539% | | \$8,830.28 |
| Palo Alto | \$412,252,000 | 22.1036802% | | \$22,431.44 |
| Santa Clara | \$535,623,958 | 28.7185039% | | \$29,144.35 |
| Saratoga | \$20,280,804 | 1.0873941% | | \$1,103.52 |
| Sunnyvale | \$283,902,115 | 15.2219554% | | \$15,447.67 |
| Total Cities (excluding San Jose) | \$1,865,083,086 | 100.0000000% | | \$101,482.83 |
| Total Cities (including San Jose) | | | | \$202,965.67 |
| Special Districts Total Share | | | 33.33333333% | \$202,965.67 |
| Aldercroft Heights County Water District | | 0.06233% | | \$126.51 |
| Burbank Sanitary District | | 0.15593% | | \$316.48 |
| Cupertino Sanitary District | | 2.64110% | | \$5,360.53 |
| El Camino Hospital District | | 4.90738% | | \$9,960.30 |
| Guadalupe Coyote Resource Cons. District | | 0.04860% | | \$98.64 |
| Lake Canyon Community Services District | | 0.02206% | | \$44.77 |
| Lion's Gate Community Services District | | 0.22053% | | \$447.60 |
| Loma Prieta Resource Cons. District | | 0.02020% | | \$41.00 |
| Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District | | 5.76378% | | \$11,698.49 |
| Purissima Hills County Water District | | 1.35427% | | \$2,748.70 |
| Rancho Rinconada Rec. and Park District | | 0.15988% | | \$324.50 |
| San Martin County Water District | | 0.04431% | | \$89.93 |
| Santa Clara County Open Space District | | 1.27051% | | \$2,578.70 |
| Santa Clara Valley Water District | | 81.44126% | | \$165,297.80 |
| Saratoga Cemetery District | | 0.32078% | | \$651.07 |
| Saratoga Fire Protection District | | 1.52956% | | \$3,104.48 |
| South Santa Clara Valley Memorial District | | 0.03752% | | \$76.15 |
| Total Special Districts | | 100.00000% | | \$202,965.67 |
| Total Allocated Costs | | | | \$608,897.01 |

Revised 2012/2013 LAFCO COST APPORTIONMENT

| Jurisdictions | Original | | | | Revised | | | | | Additional Charges/ (Refund) |
|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | LAFCO Net Operating Expenses for 2013 | | | | 1st Half of FY2012-13 | | 2nd Half of FY2012-13 | | Total | |
| | Revenue per 2009/2010 Report | Percentage of Total Revenue | Allocation Percentages | Allocated Costs | Allocated Amount | \$ | Allocated Amount | \$ | \$ | |
| | Allocation Percentages | Allocation Percentages | Allocation Percentages | Allocation Percentages | Allocation Percentages | Allocation Percentages | Allocation Percentages | Allocation Percentages | Allocation Percentages | |
| County | N/A | N/A | 50.0000000% | \$281,780.00 | 50.0000000% | 140,890.00 | 33.3333333% | 93,926.67 | 234,816.67 | (\$46,963.33) |
| Cities | | | | | 50.0000000% | 140,890.00 | 33.3333333% | 93,926.67 | 234,816.67 | |
| San Jose | N/A | N/A | 25.0000000% | \$140,890.00 | 25.0000000% | 70,445.00 | 16.6666667% | 46,963.33 | 117,408.33 | (23,481.67) |
| Campbell | \$37,199,184 | 2.0182051% | 0.5045513% | \$2,843.45 | 0.5045513% | 1,421.72 | 0.336368% | 947.82 | 2,369.54 | (473.91) |
| Cupertino | \$51,593,772 | 2.7991693% | 0.6997923% | \$3,943.75 | 0.6997923% | 1,971.87 | 0.466528% | 1,314.58 | 3,286.46 | (657.29) |
| Gilroy | \$65,499,455 | 3.5536085% | 0.8884021% | \$5,006.68 | 0.8884021% | 2,503.34 | 0.592268% | 1,668.89 | 4,172.23 | (834.45) |
| Los Altos | \$37,223,642 | 2.0195321% | 0.5048830% | \$2,845.32 | 0.5048830% | 1,422.66 | 0.336589% | 948.44 | 2,371.10 | (474.22) |
| Los Altos Hills | \$10,074,345 | 0.5465737% | 0.1366434% | \$770.07 | 0.1366434% | 385.03 | 0.091096% | 256.69 | 641.72 | (128.34) |
| Los Gatos | \$50,773,160 | 2.7546478% | 0.6886620% | \$3,881.02 | 0.6886620% | 1,940.51 | 0.459108% | 1,293.67 | 3,234.19 | (646.84) |
| Milpitas | \$94,121,506 | 5.1064697% | 1.2766174% | \$7,194.51 | 1.2766174% | 3,597.25 | 0.851078% | 2,398.17 | 5,995.42 | (1,199.08) |
| Monte Sereno | \$2,604,662 | 0.1413134% | 0.0353283% | \$199.10 | 0.0353283% | 99.55 | 0.023552% | 66.37 | 165.91 | (33.18) |
| Morgan Hill | \$47,513,050 | 2.5777738% | 0.6444434% | \$3,631.83 | 0.6444434% | 1,815.91 | 0.429629% | 1,210.61 | 3,026.52 | (605.30) |
| Mountain View | \$163,494,125 | 8.8702129% | 2.2175532% | \$12,497.24 | 2.2175532% | 6,248.62 | 1.478368% | 4,165.75 | 10,414.37 | (2,082.87) |
| Palo Alto | \$491,995,000 | 26.6927047% | 6.6731762% | \$37,607.35 | 6.6731762% | 18,803.68 | 4.448784% | 12,535.78 | 31,339.46 | (6,267.89) |
| Santa Clara | \$478,854,381 | 25.9797733% | 6.4949433% | \$36,602.90 | 6.4949433% | 18,301.45 | 4.329962% | 12,200.97 | 30,502.42 | (6,100.48) |
| Saratoga | \$18,947,298 | 1.0279670% | 0.2569918% | \$1,448.30 | 0.2569918% | 724.15 | 0.171328% | 482.77 | 1,206.92 | (241.38) |
| Sunnyvale | \$293,287,941 | 15.9120487% | 3.9780122% | \$22,418.49 | 3.9780122% | 11,209.24 | 2.652008% | 7,472.83 | 18,682.07 | (3,736.41) |
| Cities Total | | | | \$281,780.00 | | 140,890.00 | | 93,926.67 | 234,816.67 | (46,963.33) |
| Total | \$1,843,181,521 | 100.0000000% | 100.000000% | \$563,560.00 | | | | | | |
| Total Cities (excluding San Jose) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Special Districts Total Share | | | | | - | | 33.3333333% | 93,926.7 | 93,926.67 | |
| Aldercroft Heights County Water District | | | | | - | | 0.06233% | 58.54 | 58.54 | 58.54 |
| Burbank Sanitary District | | | | | - | | 0.15593% | 146.46 | 146.46 | 146.46 |
| Cupertino Sanitary District | | | | | - | | 2.64110% | 2,480.70 | 2,480.70 | 2,480.70 |
| El Camino Hospital District | | | | | - | | 4.90738% | 4,609.34 | 4,609.34 | 4,609.34 |
| Guadalupe Coyote Resource Cons. District | | | | | - | | 0.04860% | 45.65 | 45.65 | 45.65 |
| Lake Canyon Community Services District | | | | | - | | 0.02206% | 20.72 | 20.72 | 20.72 |
| Lion's Gate Community Services District | | | | | - | | 0.22053% | 207.14 | 207.14 | 207.14 |
| Loma Prieta Resource Cons. District | | | | | - | | 0.02020% | 18.97 | 18.97 | 18.97 |
| Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District | | | | | - | | 5.76378% | 5,413.73 | 5,413.73 | 5,413.73 |
| Purissima Hills County Water District | | | | | - | | 1.35427% | 1,272.02 | 1,272.02 | 1,272.02 |
| Rancho Rinconada Rec. and Park District | | | | | - | | 0.15988% | 150.17 | 150.17 | 150.17 |
| San Martin County Water District [1] | | | | | - | | 0.04431% | 41.62 | 41.62 | 41.62 |
| Santa Clara County Open Space District | | | | | - | | 1.27051% | 1,193.35 | 1,193.35 | 1,193.35 |
| Santa Clara Valley Water District | | | | | - | | 81.44126% | 76,495.06 | 76,495.06 | 76,495.06 |
| Saratoga Cemetery District | | | | | - | | 0.32079% | 301.30 | 301.30 | 301.30 |
| Saratoga Fire Protection District | | | | | - | | 1.52956% | 1,436.66 | 1,436.66 | 1,436.66 |
| South Santa Clara Valley Memorial District | | | | | - | | 0.03752% | 35.24 | 35.24 | 35.24 |
| Total Special Districts | | | | | - | | | 93,926.67 | 93,926.67 | 93,926.67 |
| Total | | | | | | 281,780.00 | | 281,780.00 | 563,560.00 | |